



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,411	11/09/2000	John P. Veschi	VESCHI 19	2077

7590 04/11/2006

WILLIAM H. BOLLMAN
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER
2000 M STREET NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

SHARMA, SUJATHA R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2618

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1,4-6,8,12,15,16,20,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanaka [US 6,542,749].

Regarding claims 1,8,12,16 and 20, Tanaka discloses a method and system for connecting proximately located mobile users based on compatible attributes. Tanaka further discloses

- the wireless device to be a wireless PDA device (see col. 4, lines 20-32) with a wireless front end and proximity detector (see summary of invention).
- a reminder application that is triggered when the first mobile unit is in close proximate to a second mobile unit and automatically transferred from the first mobile unit/PDA to the

Art Unit: 2684

second mobile unit/PDA (see col. 7, lines 1-10, col. 14, line 60 – col. 15, line 48, Col. 16, lines 54-57, col. 17, lines 1-56).

- wherein a reminder in said reminder application is directly transferred to another wireless PDA by a detected proximity to said another wireless PDA device is less than a pre-established threshold. See col. 2, lines 39-46; col. 6, lines 5-10 and 55-58; col. 7, lines 1-10; col. 14, line 60 – col. 15, line 48; Col. 16, lines 54-57; col. 17, lines 1-56.

Regarding claim 4, Tanaka further discloses a proximity reminder table, in communication with reminder application, to associate other wireless PDA devices with specific reminder tasks. See Figs. 4,5 7, col. 5, line 39-col. 6, line 10, col. 4, lines 28-32, col. 6, line 66-col. 7, line 10 and col. 14, line 60 – col. 15, line 48, col. 17, lines 1-55.

Regarding claim 5, Tanaka further discloses a method where the reminder table comprises an entry associating a particular wireless PDA device with a desire to output an alert when said wireless PDA device becomes proximate to said particular wireless PDA device. See Figs. 4,5 7, col. 5, line 39-col. 6, line 10, col. 4, lines 28-32, col. 6, line 66- col. 7, line 10 and col. 14, line 60 – col. 15, line 48, col. 17, lines 1-55.

Regarding claim 6, Tanaka further discloses a method of disabling the communication/alert when said particular PDA device is in close proximate to said wireless PDA device. See col. 16, lines 54-63 and col. 19, lines 38-49.

Regarding claims 15 and 23, Tanaka discloses a method of measuring location coordinates of the first and second PDA device and determining the distance between the two devices and comparing the determined distance to a threshold distance. See col. 5, lines 1-20, col. 5, line 67 – col. 6, line 10.

1. Claims 2,3,9-11,14,17-19,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka [US 6,542,749] in view of Erikson [US 6,622,018].

Regarding claims 2,3 9-11,17-19, Tanaka as treated in claims 1,8,12,16,20 does not disclose the wireless front end to be a piconet / Bluetooth front end.

Erikson in the same field of endeavor teaches a method of connecting various mobile devices in a piconet using Bluetooth technology. See summary of invention, col. 5, lines 5-37.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Erikson to Tanaka in order to connect the various mobile devices when they are proximate to one another using Bluetooth technology and thus overcoming the short comings of other short range communication methods such as infra red which would require line of sight between connecting devices.

Regarding claims 14 and 22, Erikson further teaches a method of determining g a presence of the second PDA device in a local wireless network/piconet of said first PDA device. See summary of invention, col. 5, lines 5-37.

2. Claims 7,13,21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka [US 6,542,749] in view of Berstis [US 6,650,894].

Art Unit: 2684

Regarding claim 7, Tanaka as treated in claims 1 does not disclose a method of setting a time for the alert message and canceling the alert within a range of time of said time for said reminder alert.

Berstis, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a method of setting a time for the alert message and canceling the alert within a range of time of said time for said reminder alert. See col. 4, lines 58-67.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Berstis to Tanaka in order to conditionally control the electronic device according to conditional criteria designated by the user

Regarding claims 13 and 21, Berstis teaches a method of producing an audible alert when one mobile device is in close proximate to another mobile device. See col. 4, lines 58-67.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments submitted 2/14/06 with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 571-272-7886. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

Art Unit: 2684

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sujatha Sharma
April 6, 2006


Matthew Anderson
SPE 2618